



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/617,850	07/14/2003	Amar Lulla	TPP 31402A	7989
24257	7590	11/16/2006	EXAMINER	
STEVENS DAVIS MILLER & MOSHER, LLP			PATEL, NIHIL B	
1615 L STREET, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 850			3772	
WASHINGTON, DC 20036				

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/617,850	ULLA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nihir Patel	3772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09.08.2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 and 5-13 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1 and 5-13 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on September 8th, 2006, with respect to claims 1 and 5-13 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection(s) of previous office action dating December 18th, 2005 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1, 5 and 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Callaghan (WO 93/11817) in view of Altounyan et al. (US 4,509,515).

6. **As to claims 1, 8-13,** O'Callaghan substantially discloses a chamber **4** having an inlet to admit measured dose of medicament **5** and an outlet **8** to be received in the mouth of the user wherein the chamber is antistatic material (**see page 4**), but does not disclose a chamber made of polyamide. Altounyan in an inhalation device teaches a chamber made of polyamide providing a convenient material that does not readily acquire and retain a static charge or is treated with an anti-static agent decreasing static charge and the smoothness of the material prevents the aerosol cloud from precipitating (**see column 4 lines 3-11**). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the chamber of O'Callaghan to employ any well known polyamide material, such as the polyamide(s) taught by Altounyan, since doing so would have provide a chamber material which does not readily acquire and retains a static charge or is treated with an anti-static agent decreasing static charge and the smoothness of the material prevents the aerosol cloud from precipitating.

7. **As to claim 5,** O'Callaghan discloses wherein the divergent end of one chamber is received in the divergent end of the other member to provide a substantially air tight seal (**see figure 1**).

8. Claims **6 and 7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Callaghan and Altounyan as applied to **claims 1 and 5** above, and further in view of Sharp (GB 2,299,512).

Art Unit: 3772

9. **As to claim 6,** O'Callaghan/Altounyan substantially discloses the invention as claimed, but does not provide a complementary stepped surfaces to provide a close airtight fit. Sharp discloses an inhaler having a spacer, and further teaches divergent complementary stepped surfaces providing secure snap-fitting clips (**18, 19, 20**). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the ends of O'Callaghan /Altounyan to employ any well known securing means doing so would have provided a means to securely seal the two ends including the snap-fitting taught by Sharp.

10. **As to claim 7,** Sharp teaches a locking means (**18, 19, 20**) to lock the two members together in assembled condition.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nihir Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-4803. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 to 4:30 every other Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patricia Bianco can be reached on (571) 272-4940. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3772

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit 3772

Nihir Patel

OlBranw
11/13/04